SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

1	Ev	idence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection
2	1.	Tellstrom Deposition, 305:1-8. Exh. A to the 2/29/08 Fietz Declaration	Lack of foundation and calls for speculation. The question assumes only
3		("Fietz Dec."), cited in Plaintiffs' Opening Memo at 4:22.	one in a range of possible circumstances. FRE 602, FRE 701. <sup>2</sup>
4	2	Tolletrom Donosition, 285:20, 286:7	Lack of foundation and calls for
5	2.	Tellstrom Deposition, 285:20-286:7. Exh. A to the Fietz Dec.; cited in Plaintiffs' Opening Memo at 4:22.	speculation. The fact that the witness cannot think of a reason for something
6		riamimo opening memo at m22.	during a deposition does not prove the absence of any legitimate reason. FRE
7			602, FRE 701. In fact, the individual responsible for Plaintiffs' time edits, Store
8 9			Manager John Hansen, testified that he had legitimate reasons for changing
10			punches to subtract time. Hansen Deposition 583:14-584:21; 594:15-596:8 (Exh. D to the 3/14/08 Opposition
11			Declaration of Beth Hirsch Berman; hereafter "Berman Dec.").
12	3.	Hansen Deposition 535:17-22	Incomplete excerpt (See, Hansen
13	<i>J</i> .	(attached as Exh. C to the Fietz Dec., and cited in Plaintiffs' Opening Memo	Deposition 535:7-22; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.); As to 535:17-22; Hearsay. FRE
14		at 4:25.	802.
15	4.	Hansen Deposition 536:7-8 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec., and cited at 4:25 of the	Incomplete excerpt (See, Hansen Deposition 536:4-21; Exh. C to the Fietz
16		Opening Memo).	Dec.); Lack of foundation; Hearsay. FRE 602, FRE 802.
17	5.	Hansen Deposition 536:13-14 (Exh. C	Incomplete excerpt. Lack of foundation;
18		to the Fietz Dec., and cited at 4:25 of the Opening Memo).	Hearsay. FRE 602, FRE 802.
19	6.	Hansen Deposition 584:5-11 (Exh. C	Incomplete excerpt. A complete citation
20	0.	to the Fietz Dec., cited at 4:25 of the Opening Memo).	(Hansen Deposition 584:5-21; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.) does not stand, for the
21		· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	proposition cited (that Plaintiffs time was shaved). Hansen testified he could not
22			recall whether he had a legitimate reason for the reduction in time.
23	7.	Hansen Deposition 585:8-9 (Exh. C to	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the
24	,	Fietz Dec., cited at 4:25 in the Opening Memo).	proposition cited in the memo (See, 585:8-23; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.). The cited
25		. ,	testimony is that Hansen did not recall why
26			

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Citations such as 4:22 are to page and line numbers.

<sup>2</sup> To the extent that this chart identifies objections to Tellstrom's deposition testimony, it repeats objections made on the record during the deposition.

- 2 -

1	Ev	idence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection
2 3			he made the punch change. Hansen repeatedly testified that it was not possible to infer an illegitimate motive from any
4 5			specific punch change he made. See, Hansen Deposition 586:16-21; 587:16-24; 605:7-606:19; 635:9-23; 651:14-652:8
			(Exhibit D to the Berman Dec.).
6	8.	Hansen Deposition 590:6-20 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec., cited at 4:25 of the	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the proposition cited in the memo (See, 590:6-
7		Opening Memo).	591:23; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.). The remainder of the testimony states that the
8			person who made the change (Hansen) cannot attest that it was done to "shave"
9			time. See, 591:6-23; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.
10			
11	9.	Hansen Deposition 591:10-13 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec., cited at 4:25 of the	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the proposition cited in the memo. See,
12		Opening Memo).	591:14-23; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.: Question: "Were you depriving Ms.
13			Richmond of overtime that she worked on 6/28/2006?" Answer: I honestly can't
14			remember if I was or not. I don't know. Question: "You can't tell from this
15			[referring to the audit trail report]" Answer: "I mean, to look at it, yes. I
16			would have to say just looking at this, I would have to say that's what I was doing.
17			But I don't know what the circumstances. Like before, I don't know what the
18			circumstances were."
19	10.	Hansen Deposition 591:19-21 (Exh.	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the
20		C to the Fietz Dec;, cited in the Opening Memo at 4:25).	proposition cited in the memo (See, 591:10-23; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.).
21	11.	Hansen Deposition 605:7-606:5 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.; cited in the	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the proposition cited in the memo (See, 606:6-
22		Opening Memo at 4:26).	19; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.).
23	12.		Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the
24		to the Fietz Dec.; cited in the Opening Memo at page 4:26).	proposition cited in the memo (See, 619:17-21; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.).
25	13.	Hansen Deposition 624:13-21 (Exh. C	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the
26		to the Fietz Dec.; cited in the Opening Memo at page 4:26).	proposition cited in the memo (See, 624:1-21; Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.).
27		, ,	,
28			
.in &		<b>-</b> ;	3 -

KAUFF MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP
ONE POST STREET
SUITE 2600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

Case 3:07-cv-03108-JSW	Document 57	Filed 03/13/2008	Page 4 of 7

1	Evidence To Which Objection is Marie	Crounds For The Older
	Evidence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection
2	14. Hansen Deposition 654:1-5 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.; cited in the Opening	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the proposition cited in the memo (See,
4	Memo at page 4:26).	Hansen Deposition 654:1-658:17; Exh. D to the Berman Dec.). Hansen's testimony is that he believes he added the deducted
5		time on another date, so that the employee had no lost time.
6	15. Hansen Deposition 659:9-14 (Exh. C	Incomplete excerpt; not supportive of the
7	to the Fietz Dec.; cited in the Opening Memo at 4:26).	proposition cited in the memo. See, Hansen Deposition 659:15-25 (Exh. C to the Fietz Dec.) where Hansen testifies that
8		he restored the deducted time three days later.
9	16. Baas Declaration at 4:21-25 (¶ 14).	Lack of foundation; Improper opinion.
10	(  14).	FRE 602, FRE 701, FRE 702. Baas did not make the punch she is describing
11 12		(Hansen did), and Baas has no recollection of the circumstances of this punch. Baas Deposition 253:24-
13		254:4256:16-257:4 (Exh. G to the Berman Dec.).
14	17. Baas Declaration at 4:26-5:8 (¶ 15);	Object to conclusions regarding "time
15	Exhibit C.	shaving". Lack of foundation, given that the declarant did not make the punches
16		and cannot testify to the reason for the punch; particularly when one person
17		making the punches (Hansen) testified that one could draw no conclusions from the
18		face of the time records. Improper opinion testimony in that Plaintiffs have not
19		established that the declarant has any particularized scientific, technical or other
20		specialized knowledge allowing the rendering of such opinion. Exhibit C is not
21		a reliable summary of Exhibit D, and therefore should be excluded on the
22		additional grounds of being misleading. The portion of Exhibit C referenced in this
23		paragraph of the Baas declaration has eight entries, all purported to show
24		"shaved" time. Two entries for 9/27/06 are duplicates. Three entries for 1/21/07 (one
25		misdated as 1/21/06) are duplicates. Two entries for 12/24/06 (both are misdated;
26		the underlying time record shows this entry with a date of 12/23/06) are duplicates.
27		One reference (to 9/27/06 ES, -8) is to an overridden punch that does not appear as
28		the employee's punch time. Out of the 8

-4-

KAUFF MCCLAIN &
MCGUIRE LLP
ONE POST STREET
SUITE 2600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

1	Evidence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection
2		instances cited on Exhibit C, there are only three separate punches. <sup>3</sup> FRE 403, FRE
3		602, FRE 701, FRE 702.
4	18. Baas Declaration at 3:8-13; 3:14-16; 3:21-22; 4:23-25; 5:3; 5:6-8; 5:10-14,	Lack of a showing that Baas has sufficient scientific, technical or other specialized
5	5:17-19; 5:25-26; 6:2-3; 6:4:10, 6:12- 13 as to the conclusions of "time	knowledge sufficient to render what is essentially an expert opinion. FRE 702.
6	shaving:; Exhibit C to the Baas Dec.	See, United States of America v. Raul
7		Figueroa-Lopez (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) 125 F.3d 1241,1246-7, cert. denied (1998) 523 U.S.
8		1131. (A lay witness cannot testify to matters involving specialized knowledge.)
9		Lack of personal knowledge as to the circumstances of each punch. FRE 602.
10		For example, 51 entries on Exhibit C are punches shown as changed by Thonya
11		Burger. Such changes cannot however be used, as Plaintiffs purport to do, to prove a
12		Company policy of time shaving as John Hansen testified that he found irregularities
13		in time recording at Store 2262 by Burger, reported them to District Manager Rick
14		Tellstrom and worked with Dollar Tree personnel to correct any mispayments.
15	,	Hansen Deposition, 257:5-258:25; 309:5-310:9; 477:19-479:23. (Exh. D to the
16	·	Berman Dec.). Hansen testified that he had an understanding any monies found to
17		be due employees would be paid. (479:6-11). Hansen further testified: Q: "How do
18		you have that understanding?" A: "Actually the only way is that people say,
19		you know, we need to get to the source of the problem, get these people money if we
20		owe it to them. That'syou know." Q: "Who said that to you?" A: Rick
21		(Tellstrom) has said it, and I believe Pat (Pat Doss in payroll) said it when I talked
22		to Rick." (479:14-21). This situation proves the opposite of what Plaintiffs urge;
23		namely, it demonstrates the Company's enforcement of its policies requiring pay
24		for all time worked.
25		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The mistakes in the chart regarding Lofquist's time should be sufficient to exclude the entire chart as they establish a lack of reliability regarding the conclusions drawn, even if the Court were to deem that the requisite scientific or other particularized knowledge has been established.

- 5 -

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

26

27

1	Evidence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection
2	19. Baas Declaration at 5:26; Exhibit C to the Baas Dec.	Lack of personal knowledge; improper opinion testimony; not qualified to provide
3		expert testimony; misleading statements. FRE 403, 602, 701, 702. For example, ¶
4		18 (page 5, line 26) states that the "Manager" column on Exhibit C "refers to
5		the identity of the person making the change". Hansen however testified that he
6		entered changes using his wife's password. Hansen Dep. 567:12-22. (Exh.
7		D to the Berman Dec.) It is not therefore accurate to state that the Manager column
8		always shows the person who made the change.
9	20. Baas Declaration at 3:8-13; 3:14-16;	Lack of personal knowledge; improper
10	3:21-22; 4:23-25; 5:3-8; 5:10-14, 5:17-19; 5:25-26; 6:2-3; 6:4:10, 6:12-	opinion testimony; not qualified to provide expert testimony; misleading statements.
11	13 as to the conclusions of "time shaving"; Exhibit C to the Baas Dec.	FRE 403, 602, 701, 702. For example, Exhibit C cites some changes made under
12	onaving , Exhibit o to the Bade Book	the Miguel Cruz's password. However, Cruz testified that it would not be possible
13		to identify whether a change of his was legitimate or not by looking at the audit trail
14		reports. Cruz Dep. 484:24-485:9. (Exh. E to the Berman Dec.).
15	21. Baas Declaration at 3:8-13; 3:14-16;	Lack of personal knowledge; improper
16	3:21-22; 4:23-25; 5:3; 5:6-8; 5:10-14, 5:17-19; 5:25-26; 6:2-3; 6:4:10, 6:12-	opinion testimony; not qualified to provide expert testimony; misleading statements.
17	13 as to the conclusions of "time shaving"; Exhibit C to the Baas Dec.	FRE 403, 602, 701, 702. For example, Exhibit C cites to changes made in Store
18		1868 regarding employee number 2329343 (who is identified on DTC05069
19		as Jose Baeza). The person identified as making such changes, John Hansen, has
20		testified that one cannot infer that time was "shaved" from a negative time entry (See
21		Objection No. 7), and the individual whose time Baas asserts was "shaved", Jose
22		Baeza has provided a declaration, submitted with Defendant's opposition
23		papers, affirming that, as of the date of the declaration (1/15/08), he has not worked
24		overtime for 2 to 3 years, has been paid by Dollar Tree for all overtime worked, and
25		has not had any pay issues with Dollar
26		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Cruz testified that he used someone else's number when he first took over as Store Manager. Cruz Dep. 435:13-23. (Exh. E to the Berman Dec.)

- 6

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

27

4	Friday - Ta Whish Objection to Made	Croundo For The Objection	
1	Evidence To Which Objection Is Made	Grounds For The Objection	
2 3		Tree or any Store Manager. See, Declaration of Jose Baeza, ¶¶ 5 and 6. <sup>5</sup>	
4	22. Baas Declaration at 3:8-13; 3:14-16; 3:21-22; 4:23-25; 5:3; 5:6-8; 5:10-14, 5:17-19; 5:25-26; 6:2-3; 6:4:10, 6:12-	Lack of personal knowledge; improper opinion testimony; not qualified to provide expert testimony; misleading statements.	
5	13 as to the conclusions of "time shaving"; Exhibit C to the Baas Dec.	FRE 403, 602, 701, 702. While Exhibit C purports to show a "practice" among 12	
6		stores in Northern California, only six stores are reflected on Exhibit C and the	
7		great majority of cited punch edits are from two stores (1868 and 2262) under three	
8		store managers, Burger, Hansen and Cruz. Of the 202 entries depicted on	
9		Exhibit C, only 13 are from stores other than 1868 and 2262. See Declaration of	
10		Jude Anthony in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification, ¶ 4.	
11	DATED: Moroh 12, 2008	KAUFF MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP	
12	DATED: March 13, 2008	NAOI I MICCEAIN & MICCOINE EEI	
13		Bv: / \$ /	
14		By:/ \$ / ALEX HERNAEZ	
15		Attorneys for Defendant	
16		DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.	
17	4828-6036-0450.1		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25 26	5	f Danala da alamatica a constitucione constitucione	
27	<sup>5</sup> In addition to showing the inadmissibility o "time shaving", the inconsistency between h	ner declaration on the one hand and the	
28	sworn statements of John Hansen and Jose Baeza on the other hand demonstrates that this case is not amenable to class treatment. Each changed punch requires an individualized inquire.		
20	individualized inquiry.	7 _	

KAUFF MCCLAIN &
MCGUIRE LLP
ONE POST STREET
SUITE 2600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111